

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to sheet 5 (Fig. 5C).
Fig. 5C has been amended to change reference number “43” to “45”.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet – Sheet 5 (Fig. 5C)
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes – Sheet 5 (Fig. 5C)

REMARKS

Claims 49-66 were pending in the present application. Claims 49-53 and 57-62 have been canceled without prejudice by this amendment. New claims 67-70 have been added by this amendment. Therefore, Claims 54-56 and 63-69 are now pending in the present application. The objections and rejections of the Office Action dated July 10, 2006 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") are described in detail below. Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections as discussed below.

Objections to the Specification

The specification was objected to due to an informality that page 15, lines 22-23 to the specification refer to "Figs. 5C and 5D" and should refer to "Figs. 5A and 5B." Office Action, Page 8.

Paragraph [0057] has been amended to make the change noted by the Examiner.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to because reference number "45" mentioned in line 24 of page 15 was not in the drawings. Office Action, Page 8. Fig. 5C has been amended to change reference number "43" to "45". A replacement drawing sheet and an annotated drawing sheet indicating the change are submitted herewith.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 49-53 and 57-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Office Action, Pages 9-10.

Claims 49-53 and 57-62 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph are not discussed in further detail herein.

Claims 54-56 and 63-66 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Office Action, Page 10. The Office Action states that Claims 54 and 63 were rejected because the specification does not describe “wherein the additional information can be extracted according to the arrangement of dots in the latent image area in the generated pattern image.” Office Action, Pages 10-11. Claims 55-56 and 64-66 were rejected as depending from a rejected base claim.

The language cited in the Office Action as being indefinite is not in the claims (either at the time of the Office Action) or as currently amended. Applicant is unclear as to the Examiner’s intended rejection. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 49-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

The rejections relating to the canceled claims (Claims 49-53 and 57-62) are not discussed herein.

As to the remaining claims, Claim 54 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph because the Examiner thought that the claim language was contradictory and confusing. More specifically, the Office Action states that the claim language ‘arranging a first dot size at the determined positions in the latent image area’ and ‘arranging dots of a second size ... at predetermined positions in the latent image area’ was “confusing and contradictory because only one dot

size is associated with the latent image area.” Office Action, Page 12. The Office Action further stated that “clarification is required.” *Id.*

Claim 54 has been amended to change the “first dot size at the determined positions in the latent-image area” to “first dot size at the determined positions in the background area”.

Applicant believes that amended claims 54 overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 55-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being dependent on rejected base claim 54. As described above, Claim 54 is definite. Therefore, the rejections of Claims 55-56 have been overcome and Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 55-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 63 was rejected on the same basis as Claim 54. Claim 63 has been amended in a similar manner to Claim 54. Therefore, Applicant believes that amended claims 63 overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 64-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being dependent on rejected base claim 63. As described above, Claim 63 is definite. Therefore, the rejections of Claims 64-66 have been overcome and Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 64-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 49-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsunoshita (U.S. Published Application 2003-0179412, hereinafter the “Matsunoshita” reference) in view of Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004-0021311, hereinafter, the “Shimada” reference).

Claim 54 includes *inter alia*, “inputting means for inputting area-assignment information that defines latent-image area and background area, and additional information which is different from any of the latent-image area, the background area and the area-assignment information” and wherein the additional information which is different from any of the latent-image area, the background area and the area-assignment information can be extracted by determining directions to which positions of the arranged dots are away from the predetermined positions.”

The Office Action states that the Matsunoshita reference “is silent to the claim limitation wherein the additional information can be extracted based on the difference between the positions of the arranged dots and predetermined positions.” Office Action, Page 25. The Office Action alleges that Shimada reference cures the defects in the Matsunoshita reference. More specifically, the Office Action states that “Shimada teaches the claim limitation wherein the additional information can be extracted based on the difference between the positions of the arranged dots and predetermined positions (*See Shimada Paragraph 0101, 0110, 0166*).”

Applicant respectfully submits that the Shimada reference does not overcome the deficiencies of the Matsunoshita reference as described below.

The Shimada reference discloses in paragraph [0110] that branched latent image lines (line 108 in Fig. 9, i.e., lines that are away from each other) and non-latent image line (line 107 in Fig. 9, i.e., a wide line) exist. The Shimada reference discloses that the line 108 is recognized lighter than the line 107 when UV light is irradiated. Thus, according to the Shimada reference, a latent image can be recognized by human beings because lines which are away from each other are less recognized than wide lines by UV light.

However, the Shimada reference does not teach or suggest inputting means for inputting area-assignment information that defines latent-image area and background area, and additional information which is different from any of the latent-image area, the background area and the area-assignment information” and wherein the additional information which is different from any of

the latent-image area, the background area and the area-assignment information can be extracted by determining directions to which positions of the arranged dots are away from the predetermined positions as required by Claim 54.

Since the cited and applied references, when taken either alone or in combination do not teach all of the limitations of Claim 54, Claim 54 is believed allowable over the cited and applied references.

Claims 55-56 and 67-68 are believed allowable because they depend from allowable base claim 54. Furthermore, the dependent claims include additional allowable elements. For example, claim 67 includes the feature that “the length between each of positions of the arranged dots and each of the predetermined positions is less than half of the length between two of the predetermined positions.” Such a feature is not taught or suggested in the cited and applied references.

Claim 63 was rejected on the same basis as Claim 54. Claim 63 is believed allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with reference to Claim 54.

Dependent claims 64-66 and 69 which depend from Claim 63 are believed allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, the dependent claims also include independently patentable elements.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact
Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

	Respectfully submitted,
October 9, 2006	/Marlene Klein/
<hr/>	<hr/>
Date	Marlene Klein, Reg. No. 43,718 Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3132
Fax: (949) 932-3560